Antimicrobial Copper

Economics and case studies

Healthcare, Environment and Infrastructure Stamford Bridge, London 4th December 2013 **STAND 130**

Mark Tur, CDA Technical Consultant



Version 1.4

Content

- 01.00 Introduction & context
- 02.00 Clinical evidence and case studies
- 03.00 What about cost?
- 04.00 Conclusion and next steps

01.00 Introduction & context



Europe – some headline numbers

HCAIS... infections resulting from healthcare interventions

- 7.1% overall prevalence rate over 4.1 million patients affected
- Up to 51% prevalence in Intensive Care Units (ICUs)
- 16 million extra days in hospital
- Direct costs: €7 billion
- 37,000 deaths directly caused by HCAIs
- Additional 110,000 deaths where HCAIs contributory factor



HCAIs – Influence of the environment

- There has been little evidence of the role of environmental microbial contamination in HCAI acquisition
 - but that is changing:
 - proposals for acceptable levels of microorganisms in the clean environment are being developed – transferred from the food industry
 - there is an increasing awareness of the role of touch surfaces in transmitting infection, evidenced by an increasing number of research papers on the topic
 - Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology published a Special Topic Issue: The Role of the Environment in Infection Prevention (May 2013)



1983

Doorknobs: a source of nosocomial infection?

This hospital study is a reminder of the often ignored fact that brass is bactericidal, while stainless steel is not.

PHYLLIS J. KUHN, PhD

S leek and shining stainless steel doorknobs and push plates look reassuringly clean on a hospital door. By contrast, doorknobs and push plates of tarnished brass look dirty and contaminating. But even when tarnished, brass—an alloy typically of 67% copper and 33% zinc—is bactericidal, while stainless steel—about 88% iron

vestigation of bacterial growth on metal, small strips of stainless steel, brass, aluminum, and copper were inoculated with broths of *Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus, Streptococcus* group D, and *Pseudomonas* species. The broths contained approximately 10⁷ bacteria/ml, a very heavy inoculum. Then the strips were air-dried for 24

tion, brass and copper covered with seeded aga bated in culture for 24 cause the metals are t pected a zone of inhibit the strips, but instead, i bacteria piled up by th the strips. Why? Accore Arndt-Shultz law, low le sons tend to stimulate b



Why touch surfaces?



As shown above, just because touch surfaces are cleaned does not mean they are really clean. In addition, as a contaminated hand will spread germs to the next seven surfaces touched², having an inactive surface offers no protection against recontamination and the spread of microbes.



Professor Schmidt's team has published data providing insights

- There was a reduction in HCAIs in copper rooms: 10 (3.40%) v 26 (8.12%); p= 0.013
- Of the 4,450,545 bacteria recovered during the trial, only 17%, rather than an expected 50%, were isolated from rooms with copper objects
- Acquisition of HCAIs was linked to bioburden:



8 Copper Surfaces Reduce the Rate of Healthcare-Acquired Infections in the Intensive Care Unit. Salgado CD et al. ICHE Special Topic Issue: The Role of the Environment in Infection Prevention. May 2013

Antimicrobial Copper Cu^H

02.00 Clinical evidence and case studies



Independent clinical trials have been conducted at multiple locations around the world





Fighting infections is a multifaceted challenge



- Antimicrobial Copper needs to be seen as a supplement to, not a substitute for, standard infection control practices.
- One must continue to follow all current practices, including those related to cleaning and disinfection of environmental surfaces.
- Antimicrobial Copper is compatible with hospital cleaning agents.
- Antimicrobial Copper alloy surfaces must not be waxed, painted, lacquered, varnished, or otherwise coated. The alloys oxidize to varying degrees, which does not impair their antimicrobial efficacy.



University Hospitals Birmingham, NHS Foundation Trust

Selly Oak clinical trial - UK



University Hospitals Birmingham



UHB, NHS Foundation Trust

Selly Oak clinical trial - UK







UHB, NHS Foundation Trust

Selly Oak clinical trial - UK



























Reinhard Tennert, Director of AKH:

"It is important for us to get ahead with investing in supplementary hygiene measures, and to therefore be able to offer our youngest patients the best possible protection against infections carried by germs.

Cases of illness resulting from a lack of hygiene are **unethical**, **extremely expensive** due to treatment costs of up to a quarter of a million Euros per case of treatment, and furthermore have a negative effect on the **image** of the whole organisation."

Homerton University Hospital, London, UK



Homerton University Hospital NHS



Homerton University Hospital, London, UK









Roberto del Rio Children's Hospital, Chile

 Paediatric Hospital







Roberto del Rio Children's Hospital, Chile

 Paediatric Hospital







Roberto del Rio Children's Hospital, Chile

Doctor Ignacio Hernandez, Director of Roberto del Rio:

"This initiative will benefit children who are hospitalised in critical conditions as they will be in a healthier environment."









03.00 What about cost?





An Economic Evaluation of the use of Copper in Reducing the Rate of Healthcare Associated Infections in the UK

Presented at:

- WHO International Infection Control Conference, Geneva (ICPIC 2013)
- The International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research, Dublin (ISPOR 2013)

Providing Consultancy & Research in Health Economics

THE UNIVERSITY of Jork INVESTO



York Health Economics Consortium

The Business Case for Copper

- YEHC Global leader in healthcare associated modelling
- Model developed to calculate payback for upgrading to copper
- Allows input of local HCAI rates and costs
- Works in £, € or \$
- Fully referenced model



York Health Economics Consortium



| YORK Health Economics Consortium | Model Inputs | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Title Sheet | Set-Up Effectiveness Cost | Resource Use References |
| Inputs | The purpose of this sheet is to set up the model for the ap entered in the cells shaded in green. Whether or not copp pathogen in the model can be entered in the appropriate g | er items will be introduced to general wards, ICU or s |
| | Number of beds in unit | 20 |
| Calculations | Average length of stay in ICU (days) | 5.7 |
| | Average length of stay ward/single room (days) | 3.0 |
| | Calculated number of patients per year (Cohort) | 1,200 |
| Results | Yearly change in number of patients | 0% |
| Results | | |
| | Setting ICU | ▼ → |
| | Infection to be included in the model: | All Healthcare Associated Infections |
| | Currency: | Euro (I) |
| | | |



Outcome and length of stay in different European and North American ICUs. Results from the European/North American scoring multicenter study in 137 ICUs with 13,152 intensive care patients (51)

| Country | ICU Patients (n) | Mortality Rate (%) | Length of ICU Stay (days) | Length of Hospital Stay (days)*** | Mean Score SAPS II | Mortality Observed/Expected |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Belgium | 1,091 | 21.7 | 6.2 | 21.5 | 0.9 | 1.12 |
| Finland | 720 | 17.6 | 4.1 | 14.0 | 31.0 | 0.88 |
| France | 1,393 | 28.9 | 9.7 | 18.9 | 40.5 | 0.92 |
| Germany* | 1,807 | 15.7 | 6.0 | 21.0** | 30.3 | 0.9 |
| Italy | 1,297 | 31.3 | 7.2 | 20.5 | 38.6 | 1.07 |
| Spain | 1,270 | 27.1 | 9.5 | 22.8 | 32.2 | 1.31 |
| Switzerland | 756 | 13.8 | 4.9 | 17.6 | 30.7 | 0.74 |
| The | 950 | 20.0 | 5.5 | 19.3 | 31.3 | 1.02 |
| Netherlands United Kingdom | 136 | 32.4 | 5.7 | 14.8 | 42.1 | 0.96 |
| U.S./Canada | 3,732 | 19.7 | 5.9 | 17.1 | 32.1 | 0.96 |
| Total | 13,152 | 21.8 | 6.6 | 19.1 | 33.2 | 0.99 |

* Including one ICU from Austria

** The average length of stay in German hospitals is about 14 days

*** No. of days in hospital from beginning of ICU stay

















| YORK Health Economics Consortium | Model Inputs |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Title Sheet | Set-Up Effectiveness Cost Resource Use References |
| Inputs | This sheet is used to enter the resources a patient will use as a result of acquiring an infection. These are extra days in hospital and subsequent visits to a GP and/or an outpatient visit. These resources are assumptions and should be changed to reflect local care pathways |
| Calculations | Extra days in hospital General practitioner visit Follow up outpatient visit |
| Results | All Healthcare Associated Infections 6 1 1 |
| | |





5 year results

| | Copper | Baseline | Incremental |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Total cost (excluding cost of infections)* | € 140,700 | € 99,700 | € 41,000 |
| Number of infections | 720 | 900 | 180 |
| Cost per infection averted (excluding cost of in | fections) | | € 227.78 |
| Total QALYS gained | | | 64.44 |
| Cost per QALY | | | € 636.25 |
| Cost of infections* | € 4,320,000.00 | € 5,400,000.00 | <i>-</i> € 1,080,000.00 |
| Total cost of intervention* | € 4,460,700.00 | € 5,499,700.00 | <i>-</i> € 1,039,000.00 |
| Cost per infection averted | | | Dominant |

*These are direct costs to the hospital (no GP costs or societal costs have been included in the model)

| Number of bed days saved per year | 216 |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Cost per bed day day saved per year | € 189.81 |

The number of bed days saved per year is 216, this would allow an increased capacity in the ICU by 38 beds with a typical length of stay of 5.7 days.

| Return on investment | < 3 months |
|----------------------|------------|
|----------------------|------------|

The cost of the copper upgrade is $\leq 140,700$ compared to $\leq 99,700$ for installation of non-copper items. There were 720 infections in the copper group over the period and 900 in the baseline. This results in a cost per infection averted of ≤ 227.78 .

These results are based on the following scenario:

| Number of beds per unit | 20 |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Number of patients per year | 1,200 |
| Setting | ICU |
| Percentage reduction in infections | 20.0% |
| Type of infection | All Healthcare Associated Infections |





| factor | reference | example |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| HCAI rate in ICUs | 25% | 15% |
| reduction in HCAIs | 58% | 20% |
| | | |
| pay back time | | < 3 months |
| no of bed days saved per year | | 216 |
| cost per bed day saved per year | | €189.90 |





| factor | reference | example 1 | example 2 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| HCAI rate in ICUs | 25% | 15% | 25% |
| reduction in HCAIs | 58% | 20% | 20% |
| | | | |
| pay back time | | < 3 months | < 1 month |
| no of bed days saved per year | | 216 | 360 |
| cost per bed day saved per year | | €189.90 | €113.90 |





04.00 Conclusion & next steps



5 reasons to install Antimicrobial Copper touch surfaces

- 1. A supplement to standard hygiene practices
- 2. Continuous and significant bioburden reduction
- 3. Improved patient outcomes
- 4. A simple, cost-effective intervention
- 5. Payback in less than one year

Home

Wh

Why Antimicrobial Copper?

Scientific Proof

Markets and Applications Find Products and Partners News and Download Centre Supply Chain Resources

Antimicrobial Efficacy How it Works Public Health Claims Clinical Trials Laboratory Testing EPA Registration Research Groups Scientific References

"Nearly 300,000 people acquire Healthcare Associated Infections in the UK each year."

Taylor L, Plowman R and Roberts J A, A challenge of hospital-acquired infection, National Audit Office 2001



Home > Antimicrobial Copper UK and Ireland > Scientific Proof > How it Works

The Science behind Antimicrobial Copper

Science suggests that Antimicrobial Copper kills bacteria with a multifaceted attack.

The mechanism by which Antimicrobial Copper kills bacteria is complex by nature, but the effect is simple. The questions and answers below summarise active and ongoing research seeking to explain how Antimicrobial Copper is the most effective touch surface.

How does copper affect bacteria?

Science suggests that copper surfaces affect bacteria in two sequential steps: the first step is a direct interaction between the surface and the bacterial outer membrane, causing the membrane to rupture. The second is related to the holes in the outer membrane, through which the cell loses vital nutrients and water, causing a general weakening of the cell.

How can copper punch holes in a bacterium?

Every cell's outer membrane, including that of a single cell organism like a bacterium, is characterised by a stable electrical micro-current. This is often called 'transmembrane potential', and is, literally, a voltage difference between the inside and the outside of a cell. It is strongly suspected that when a bacterium comes in contact with a copper surface, a short circuiting of the current in the cell membrane can occur. This weakens the membrane and creates holes

Related Links

Brochures, Presentations and Articles Scientific References Proper Use and Care FAQs

Contact Centre

- Book a meeting
- Request a call

Newsletter

Receive periodic emails covering breaking news, research findings, upcoming events and more...

| Email: | | |
|--------|--|--|
| | | |



What you can do

- take the message home: tell your executives & decision makers
- (tell the sales team)
- consider copper as a new opportunity during hospital new builds, ward or unit refurbishments
- visit anticrobialcopper.org for products & science

Keep in touch

- visit www.antimicrobialcopper.org
- sign up for newsletters (about 4 per year)
- visit us on **STAND 130**
- any feedback or questions can be sent to:

info@copperalliance.org.uk



Antimicrobial Copper

visit us on **STAND 130**

Thank you

Any questions?

Mark Tur, Technical Consultant, CDA

